

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-20 are currently pending. Claims 1, 10 and 11, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, and specifically at page 12, lines 12-24. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

**II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 10-14 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama et al. and presumably in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,259,859 to Katsuki et al.

Claims 5, 7, 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. in view of Katsuki et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,187,589 to Kono et al.

Claims 6 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. in view of Katsuki et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,469,270 to Yamamoto.

Claims 9 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sugiyama et al. in view of Katsuki et al. and Kono et al. and further in view of Yamamoto.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A video recording apparatus comprising...

dividing means for dividing a memory of said recording apparatus into a plurality of blocks, each of said plurality of blocks having a reduced video image, said reduced video image of each block being a composite of images from each of said plurality of input streams.” (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama et al. relates to a video printer that deletes a frame of video data stored in a frame memory and mutes data that is written in the frame memory over previously written video data by operating a memory delete key. A mute image is displayed on a monitor. In order to delete one of a matrix of sub-frames of a multi-frame image, the sub-frame to be deleted is designated prior to operating the memory delete key, so that mute data is written in a corresponding location of the frame memory. An image containing a blank in at least one sub-frame may be printed out.

U.S. Patent No. 6,259,859 to Katsuki et al. relates to a recording apparatus for storing input video and audio data temporarily in a memory.

The Office Action stated that Sugiyama discloses a dividing means. However, Applicants submit that Sugiyama states that one frame is sectioned into a plurality of sub-frames and the video data of a plurality of images is written in the frame memory such that each sub-

frame is assigned to one of the plurality of images. (See Sugiyama, column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 3) In contrast, the instant claims indicate that each section (or block) includes a reduced image and that each one of those reduced images in each block is formed from a combination of frames from each of the plurality of input streams (clearly illustrated in Figs. 2 and 3A-3E of the drawings). This is not the case in Sugiyama. Sugiyama merely divides a frame and assigns a whole image (not reduced portions of images) to each section of the divided frame. Furthermore, Sugiyama does not use data from a plurality of different input streams. Sugiyama merely uses different frames from one stream of data (not multiple streams).

Applicants submit that Sugiyama, Katsuki, Kono and Yamamoto, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion of dividing means for dividing a memory of a recording apparatus into a plurality of blocks, each of the plurality of blocks having a reduced video image, the reduced video image of each block being a composite of images from each of the plurality of input streams, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, amended independent claims 10 and 11 are also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 10 and 11 are patentable.

### III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By Thomas F. Presson  
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800